



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,474	09/15/2003	Kenneth W. Shirriff	15437-0641	3748

45657 7590 05/17/2007
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
AND SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

GILLIS, BRIAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,474	Applicant(s) SHIRRIFF ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian J. Gillis	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is in excess of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 18-20, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 32, 33, 35-39, 41, 42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the first event forwarder" in lines 9-10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "said event information" in line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "said event monitor" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "said event monitor" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "said event monitor" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 32 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 33 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 35 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 36 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 37 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 38 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 39 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 41 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 44 recites the limitation "said cluster" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 17-20, 22, 23, 25, 27-29, 33, 34, 36-38, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PG PUB US2004/0119736).

Claim 1 discloses a system for event notification, comprising: a first node comprising: a first node event generator for detecting a situation of interest on the first node, and generating an event when a situation of interest is detected, and transmitting the event; a first node event forwarder, the first node event forwarder receiving the transmitted event from the first node event generator, the first event forwarder transmitting the event; an event buffer comprising a first list of significant events, the

event buffer receiving the event transmitted from the first node event forwarder; and an event monitor comprising a node status display, the event monitor polling the event buffer for an event, wherein the node status display is updated when the event monitor receives an event. Royce et al teaches of detecting an event which triggers a notice to be generated and transmitted (column 4, lines 25-35) and the outboard console personal computer (OBCP) receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach of an event buffer comprising a first list of significant events, the event buffer receiving the event transmitted from the first node event forwarder; and an event monitor comprising a node status display, the event monitor polling the event buffer for an event, wherein the node status display is updated when the event monitor receives an event. Chen et al teaches of storing the events by the obtaining module (paragraph 21) and the administrative workstation obtains and displays the events in real time (paragraph 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the storing and displaying of events features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 2 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 wherein the event buffer comprises a database for storing received events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21).

Claim 6 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 further comprising: a second node comprising a second node event generator for detecting a situation of interest on the second node, generating an event when a situation of interest is detected, and transmitting the event; a second node event forwarder, the second node event forwarder receiving the transmitted event from the second node event generator, the second node event forwarder transmitting the event to the event buffer. Royce et al further teaches of multiple nodes, which detects an event, which triggers a notice, to be generated and transmitted (figure 2, column 4, lines 25-35) and the OBCP receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 7 discloses the system for event notification of claim 6 wherein the event buffer comprises a database for storing received events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21).

Claim 11 discloses the system for event notification of claim 6 wherein the second node further comprises a second event buffer, wherein the second event buffer receives events transmitted from at least one of the first node event forwarder and the second node event forwarder. Royce et al further teaches of the system can have multiple devices monitoring (figure 2).

Claim 12 discloses the system for event notification of claim 11 wherein the second event buffer comprises a second list of significant events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a buffer (paragraph 21).

Claim 13 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 wherein the node status display comprises a graphic display. Chen et al further teaches the display is a graphic display (figure 7, paragraph 28).

Claim 17 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is an application integrated with at least one of the event monitor, and the event buffer. Chen et al further teaches the event-setting module is integrated with a database (paragraphs 21 and 23).

Claim 18 discloses a network for event notification, comprising: an event forwarding mechanism in each node for forwarding detected events to each other node; an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent events and for triggering a display update to display refreshed event information. Royce et al teaches of the OBCP receives an event notice and transmits the notice through the network (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach of an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent events and for triggering a display update to display refreshed event information. Chen et al teaches of storing the events by the obtaining module (paragraph 21) and the administrative workstation obtains and displays the events in real time (paragraph 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the storing and displaying of events features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 19 discloses the network of claim 18 further comprising: an event generation mechanism in each node to generate an event when something of interest occurs within said cluster. Royce et al further teaches of detecting an event, which triggers an event notice, which is transmitted to the OBCP (column 4, lines 25-35).

Claim 20 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event information is displayed within a web page. Chen et al further teaches the display is a web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 22 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event monitor resides within a browser system. Chen et al further teaches the administrative work station is a browser system (paragraph 26).

Claim 23 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event buffer is located on at least one node in a cluster. Chen et al further teaches the database is stored on the administrative workstation (paragraph 21).

Claim 25 discloses the network of claim 20 wherein said web page registers pertinent events with said event monitor. Chen et al further teaches the pertinent events can be determined using the web page (paragraph 26).

Claim 27 discloses an event notification method comprising: detecting an event within a node of a cluster of nodes; forwarding said event to other nodes of said cluster;

Art Unit: 2141

storing said event within an event buffer; monitoring said event buffer periodically for pertinent events and in response to a recent pertinent event being detected within said event buffer; triggering a display update on an event information display to display information regarding said recent pertinent event. Royce et al teaches of Royce et al teaches of detecting an event which triggers a notice to be generated and transmitted (column 4, lines 25-35) and the outboard console personal computer (OBCP) receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach of storing said event within an event buffer; monitoring said event buffer periodically for pertinent events and in response to a recent pertinent event being detected within said event buffer; triggering a display update on an event information display to display information regarding said recent pertinent event. Chen et al teaches of storing the events by the obtaining module (paragraph 21) and the administrative workstation monitors, obtains and displays the events in real time (paragraph 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the storing and displaying of events features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 28 discloses a method as described in claim 27 wherein said detecting is performed by a respective event generation mechanism situated in each node of said

cluster. Royce et al further teaches each logical partition detects events on its own (column 4, lines 25-35).

Claim 29 discloses a method as described in claim 28 wherein said forwarding is performed by a respective event forwarding mechanism situated in each node of said cluster. Royce et al further teaches each logical partition connects to the OBCP, which transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 33 discloses a method as described in claim 27 wherein said forwarding forwards said event to all other nodes of said cluster. Royce et al further teaches the OBCP transmits to the devices through the network (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 34 discloses a method as described in claim 27 wherein said event information display is a web page and wherein said pertinent events comprise events registered by said web page. Chen et al further teaches detected events are displayed on the web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 36 discloses a computer-usable medium having computer-readable program code embodied therein for causing a computer system to perform a method for event notification comprising: detecting an event within a node of a cluster of nodes; forwarding said event to other nodes of said cluster; storing said event within an event buffer; monitoring said event buffer periodically for pertinent events and in response to a recent pertinent event being detected within said event buffer, triggering a display update on an event information display to display information regarding said recent pertinent event. Royce et al teaches of Royce et al teaches of detecting an event which triggers a notice to be generated and transmitted (column 4, lines 25-35) and the

Art Unit: 2141

outboard console personal computer (OBCP) receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach of storing said event within an event buffer; monitoring said event buffer periodically for pertinent events and in response to a recent pertinent event being detected within said event buffer; triggering a display update on an event information display to display information regarding said recent pertinent event. Chen et al teaches of storing the events by the obtaining module (paragraph 21) and the administrative workstation monitors, obtains and displays the events in real time (paragraph 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the storing and displaying of events features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 37 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 36 wherein said detecting is performed by a respective event generation mechanism situated in each node of said cluster. Royce et al further teaches each logical partition detects events on its own (column 4, lines 25-35).

Claim 38 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 37 wherein said forwarding is performed by a respective event forwarding mechanism situated in each node of said cluster. Royce et al further teaches each logical partition connects to the OBCP, which transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 42 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 36 wherein said forwarding forwards said event to all other nodes of said cluster. Royce et al further teaches the OBCP transmits to the devices through the network (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 43 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 36 wherein said event information display is a web page and wherein said pertinent events comprise events registered by said web page. Chen et al further teaches detected events are displayed on the web page (paragraph 21).

Claims 3-5, 8-10, 21, 30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PG PUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 1, 18, 27, and 36 above, and further in view of Labovitz et al (US PG PUB US 2003/0037136).

Claim 3 discloses the system for event notification of claim 2 wherein the database is pruned. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 2 as recited above. It fails to teach of the database being pruned. Labovitz et al teaches of the database is pruned (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 4 discloses the system for event notification of claim 3 wherein the pruning is carried out at timed intervals. Labovitz et al further teaches the database is pruned periodically (paragraph 127).

Claim 5 discloses the system for event notification of claim 4 wherein the pruning is carried out at said time intervals of between 2 and 120 seconds. Labovitz et al further teaches the frequency the database is pruned is configurable (paragraph 127).

Claim 8 discloses the system for event notification of claim 7 wherein the database is pruned. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 7 as recited above. It fails to teach of the database being pruned. Labovitz et al teaches of the database is pruned (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 9 discloses the system for event notification of claim 8 wherein the pruning is carried out at timed intervals. Labovitz et al further teaches the database is pruned periodically (paragraph 127).

Claim 10 discloses the system for event notification of claim 9 wherein the pruning is carried out at said time intervals of between 2 and 120 seconds. Labovitz et al further teaches the frequency the database is pruned is configurable (paragraph 127).

Claim 21 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event buffer further comprises: a database for storing events received from said event forwarding mechanisms; and an evictor for periodically removing events from said database. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches of the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21). It fails to teach of an evictor for periodically removing events from said database. Labovitz et al teaches of pruning the database periodically (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 30 discloses a method as described in claim 29 wherein said event buffer is located within at least one node of said cluster and further comprising clearing said event buffer of events older than a predetermined threshold. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 29 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches of the database is on the administrative workstation (paragraph 21). It fails to teach of clearing said event buffer of events older than a predetermined threshold. Labovitz et al teaches of pruning the database periodically of events older than a threshold (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 39 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 38 wherein said event buffer is located within at least one node of said cluster and further comprising clearing said event buffer of events older than a predetermined threshold. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 38 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches of the database is on the administrative workstation (paragraph 21). It fails to teach of clearing said event buffer of events older than a predetermined threshold. Labovitz et al teaches of pruning the database periodically of events older than a threshold (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claims 14-16, 26, 31, 32, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US

PGPUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 1, 18, 27, and 36 above, and further in view of Heidingsfeld et al (US Patent #6,823,359).

Claim 14 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is a stand-alone application. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 13 as recited above. It fails to teach of the graphic display is a stand-alone application. Heidingsfeld et al teaches of the display is a stand-alone application (column 5, lines 37-43).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the display stand-alone feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 15 discloses the system for event notification of claim 14 wherein the graphic display is a web page. Chen et al further teaches the display is on a web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 16 discloses the system for event notification of claim 15 wherein the web page comprises plug-ins. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the web page comprises plug-ins (figure 7).

Claim 26 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said display update comprises a frame of a displayed web page. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach of display update

comprises a frame of a displayed web page. Heidingsfeld et al teaches of updating a frame of a web page (column 5, lines 50-64).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the frame updating feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 31 discloses a method as described in claim 27 wherein said event information display is a web page generated by a browser and wherein said triggering comprises generating a frame-specific update of said web page. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 27 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches the display is a web page (paragraph 21). It fails to teach of generating a frame-specific update of said web page. Heidingsfeld et al teaches of updating a frame of a web page (column 5, lines 50-64).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the frame updating feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 32 discloses a method as described in claim 31 wherein said browser is situated on a remote monitoring computer system coupled to said cluster via a communication channel. Chen et al further teaches the web page is on the administrative workstation, which is connected through a network (figure 1, paragraph 21).

Claim 40 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 36 wherein said event information display is a web page generated by a browser and wherein said triggering comprises generating a frame-specific update of said web page. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 36 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches the display is a web page (paragraph 21). It fails to teach of generating a frame-specific update of said web page. Heidingsfeld et al teaches of updating a frame of a web page (column 5, lines 50-64).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the frame updating feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 41 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 40 wherein said browser is situated on a remote monitoring computer system coupled to said cluster via a communication channel. Chen et al further teaches the web page is

on the administrative workstation, which is connected through a network (figure 1, paragraph 21).

Claims 24, 35, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PG PUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 18, 27, and 36 above, and further in view of Villado et al (US PG PUB US2004/0111507).

Claim 24 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event monitor is a Java applet operating on a computing system remote from said cluster. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach of the event monitor being a Java applet operating on a computing system remote from said cluster. Villado et al teaches the monitoring may be implemented using JAVA remotely (paragraph 63).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Villado et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the implementation of JAVA remotely feature in Villado et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because network monitoring is improved by enabling an authorized user to view communications passing through a network in real time (Villado, paragraph 8).

Claim 35 discloses a method as described in claim 27 wherein said monitoring and said triggering are performed by a Java applet operating within a browser of a remote monitoring computer system coupled to said cluster. Royce et al in view of

Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 27 as recited above. It fails to teach of a Java applet operating within a browser of a remote monitoring computer system coupled to said cluster. Villado et al teaches the monitoring may be implemented using JAVA remotely (paragraph 63).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Villado et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the implementation of JAVA remotely feature in Villado et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because network monitoring is improved by enabling an authorized user to view communications passing through a network in real time (Villado, paragraph 8).

Claim 44 discloses the computer-usable medium as described in claim 36 wherein said monitoring and said triggering are performed by a Java applet operating within a browser of a remote monitoring computer system coupled to said cluster. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches of the limitations of claim 36 as recited above. It fails to teach of a Java applet operating within a browser of a remote monitoring computer system coupled to said cluster. Villado et al teaches the monitoring may be implemented using JAVA remotely (paragraph 63).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Villado et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the implementation of JAVA remotely feature in Villado et al with

Art Unit: 2141

the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because network monitoring is improved by enabling an authorized user to view communications passing through a network in real time (Villado, paragraph 8).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tu et al (US Patent #6,617,969) teaches of an event notification system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gillis whose telephone number is 571-272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian J Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

BJG



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER